

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in the application. By this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 10 and 19. Support for the foregoing amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 1 and 10 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/671,203 and claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/671,204. As the rejections are provisional, Applicants elect to defer responding to the rejection until copending Application Nos. 10/671,203 and 10/671,204 have been patented.

SPECIFICATION

The specification of the disclosure has been objected to because for Claims 19-27 the specification does not provide antecedent basis for the term "computer readable medium." This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended the specification as requested by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the specification based on this amendment.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bloch et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,922,408 B2) ("Bloch"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Bloch reference fails to teach the limitation of "placing the plurality of receiver buffers into the free buffer pool as the packet is transmitting out of the plurality of receiver buffers" as provided for by independent claims 1, 10 and 19. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 10 and 19 are patentable over the cited references. As claims 2-9, 11-18 and 20-28 ultimately depend upon and include the limitations of one of the independent claims, Applicants submit that these claims are also patentable over the cited references for the same reasons. Applicants request that the rejections under Section 102(e) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Final Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 13, 2009

By: /Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata, Reg. No. 37,166
Michael A. Schaldenbrand, Reg. No. 47,923

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/MAS/gmp

12281536.1